CONNECTICUT
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

January 11, 2007

Attendees:

Phil Rusconi	Premier Laboratories
Jeffrey Curran	Dept. of Public Health
Kim Maloney	Town of Wallingford
Dermot Jones	Dept. of Public Health
Philip Schlossberg	Dept. of Public Health
Barbara Obert	Baron Consulting Co,
Donna Ruokonen	Northeast Laboratories
Greg Lawrence	Phoenix Laboratories
Abdel Halim El-Sayed	MDC – Microbiologist
Bert Geuser	ACT
Kevin Miller	Fuss & O'Neill Inc.

Administrative:
1. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 AM.
2. Peter Frick and Terry Spalletta have excused absences.   Dr. Xie did not attend. We must make sure that Dr. Xie's change in email is entered correctly.
3. Acceptance of December 7th meeting minutes with Dermot's revisions. Seconded.

Old Business:

DPH Update
4. (Jeff) UCMR fact sheet was sent out to certified labs.
5. (Kevin) Coming out of an EPOC subcommittee is a proposal that would force some projects into an Ecological Risk Assessment that normally would not be required. All need to pay close attention to the feasibility of the detection limits. If using the current benchmarks, then anyone who falls under the current RSR rules will have to do an ecological risk assessment. The LEP community would like to see a margin such as 10 times the MDL where the LEP would decide if risk assessment is necessary. Should be out for public comment this year.
6. (Jeff) Most detection limits on the list are doable by alternate methods however some are not possible.
7. (Dermot) How were the limits achieved?
8. (Kevin) LC_{50} on worms based on the most sensitive benchmarks.
9. (Bert) Some logic needs to be applied. In at least on instance, site specific results were not obtained from present day activities pulling sites into the risk assessment needlessly.

10. (Kevin) For existing sites, the data quality values are based on human health criteria. Ecological impact should be considered.
11. (Bert) Has noticed a flaw in the electronic data submission for drinking water reporting. Occasionally, when water reports are submitted in a series, reports in the middle have been rejected at the state's computers even though the file shows processed.
12. (Greg) Has also experienced this problem with a client's report.
13. (Dermot) The Lab Ops committee has had discussions concerning this issue.

Election of Officers
Nominations for Chair 1) Greg – declined 2) Donna – accepted
    Vice Chair 1) Kevin – accepted
14. (Phil R) Do we have any resumes from past membership drives?
15. (Jeff) Will email to labs a list of openings for new members.
16. (Dermot) Is anyone interested in relinquishing his or her position?
17. (Abdel) Expressed interest in stepping down and has a good replacement in mind.
Voting   1) Donna voted in for Chair   2) Kevin voted in for Vice Chair
18. (Abdel) Motioned to delay nominations and vote for Secretary. Seconded and accepted.
19. (Phil R) Motion to accept nominees for Chair and Vice Chair. Seconded and accepted.

Connecticut Environmental Laboratory Regulation Subcommittees
20. (Phil S) Distributed latest version of section 2 - Registration.
21. (Jeff) Does the DEP have authority for aquatic toxicity laboratories?
22. (Bert) DEP appears to have oversight.
23. (Kevin) Our interest is including these labs is that they are soon to become a big part of the ecological risk assessment situation.
24. (Jeff) Will talk with the DEP regarding the history of aquatic toxicity labs.
25. (Abdel) Under paragraph one, "(a) reportable diseases" should not be included in environmental analysis.`
26. (Jeff) There is a Clinical Lab department at the state.
27. (Phil R) The word "utilize" implies that labs using living agents need to register.
28. (Jeff) Remove (a).
29. (Abdel) In section #2, should read, "if any person, firm or corporation is to be registered".
30. (Jeff) The regulation states that when the registrant leaves then the certification becomes null.
31. (Phil R) You have to have the physical plant with equipment and designated personnel. If the lab is sold or if the directors change then notification is required.
32. (Bert) Nowadays, corporations, unlike when the regulations were written, own laboratories.
33. (Jeff) A definition change from "examination, determination or test" to analysis. Remove (a) under exemptions Laboratories owned or operated by a state agency.
34. (Abdel) You are dealing with labs that deal with the general public for fees or as a volunteer in order to limit to specific labs and to eliminate the university laboratories.

35. (Barbara) If a university laboratory wants to do environmental research, they should not have to go to a certified laboratory for the analysis.
36. (Jeff) If the tests are conducted for in-house use, then they don't have to employ the use of a certified lab. A certified lab need not do any test performed for the purpose of process control.
37. (Bert) B. Exemptions (b) change state to CT Department of Public Health and CT Department of Environmental Protection.
38. (Jeff) Water treatment plants process control work also does not need to be done by a certified lab.
39. (Phil R) Compliance testing must be performed by a certified lab, water or wastewater.
40. (Jeff) If this were put before legislation then the DPH would have to report that the impact would be to hire another inspector.
41. (Dermot) If this is put forth you must make sure that there isn't any competing regulation. The DEP has guidance documents, which are actually regulations.
42. (Abdel) Should have a representative of each subcommittee submit terminology for their section.
43. (Jeff) There are four pages of definitions with the first draft.
44. (Phil R) Would like the group to take a stand on compliance testing and aquatic toxicity laboratory certification.
45. Agenda Item for next meeting: Nominate Secretary for 2007
46. Meeting adjourned at 11:55.

Please note: Thank you Abdel! You will truly be missed.

2007 Scheduled Meeting Dates:

February 8th	August 24th
March 16th	September 14th
April 12th	October 12th
May 18th	November 9th
June 22nd	December 14th

Submitted by: Kim Maloney